(1) (3) Final

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 2994 **/2003** **Single Bench**

PETITIONER

1. N.P. Sharma, S/o Sri K.P. Sharma aged about 53 yrs Cast-General, Occu - Asst. Grade II, Present Address M-12, C.G. M.S.M. Awasiya Parisar, Pension Bada, Raipur, Permanent Address – 5/8 Ravishankar Nagar, Bhopal (M.P.)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. Union of India thorough Secretary Dept. Of Personnel & Training, Govt. Of India New Delhi
2. State of Chhattisgarh through Secretary School Education, D.K.S. Bhawan Raipur (C.G.)
3. Secretary Chhattisgarh Higher Secondary Board D.K.S. Bhawan Raipur (C.G.)
4. Secretary M.P. Higher Secondary Board Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal (M.P.)
5. State of M..P. through Secretary School Education Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal (C.G)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS AND CERTIORARI.

CLERK TO A.G. BILASPUR 18.9.

Copy received 18.9.03 V.V.S. MURTHY

P. R. No. 2994/03 Presented by Shri P.C. Nigam dated 16.09.03

07/9/13

69

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH: BILASPUR

Single Bench: Hon'ble Shri Satish K. Agnihotri, J.

W. P. No. 2994 OF 2003

Petitioner : N.P. Sharma

Versus

Respondents : Union of India & others.

Smt. Hamida Siddique, counsel for the petitioner.
Shri S.K. Beriwal, counsel for respondent No.1/Union of India.
Shri Pankaj Shrivastava, panel lawyer for respondent No.2/State.
Shri Shailendra Shukla, counsel for respondent No.4.

ORAL ORDER

(21st February, 2006)

1. The petitioner was employed as Assistant Grade II in Board of Secondary Education, Madhya Pradesh. By order dated 25.6.2002, the petitioner has been allocated to the State of Chhattisgarh, Board of Secondary Education, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, contrary to his option. The petitioner has opted for State of M.P. on the ground that petitioner's wife is working as A.N.M. in Govt. Homoepathic Medical College Bhopal, (M.P.).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner wants to make a representation to the respondents/authorities for considering his case for reallocation to the State of Madhya Pradesh, to which learned counsel for the respondents have no objection.

3. In view of the foregoing, the petitioner is granted liberty to make a representation before the concerned authorities. The

70

concerned authorities are accordingly directed to consider and decide the representation, if any, and to pass order in accordance with law, within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of representation.

4. In view of the above, the writ petition stands disposed of. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge